

# Syntactic Patterns Used after Verbs of Exhorting<sup>1</sup>

Andrea Hasznos  
ELTE University Budapest

Numerous questions arise from the presence of Greek loanwords in Coptic, e.g., their actual origin and way into the Egyptian language. Given the nature of Coptic literature and the circumstances of its birth, the question whether these Greek words were 'put' into Coptic vocabulary through the immense translation activity<sup>2</sup> or they penetrated the language in the long bilingual situation, naturally arises. Paul Kahle had the opinion that Greek words came into Coptic through the translations of Christian texts, especially the Bible,<sup>3</sup> Alexander Böhlig, on the other hand, as well as Louis-Théophil Lefort, expressed the view "*daß bei der Herausbildung einer koptischen Schriftsprache eine große Menge griechischer Wörter verwendet wurden, die durch den bilinguen Zustand des ägyptischen Lebens auch Allgemeingut der ägyptischen Bevölkerung geworden waren.*"<sup>4</sup> Peter Nagel expressed a similar opinion in his 1971 work.<sup>5</sup> This latter had also been Arthur Vööbus' opinion, who in his time thought it impossible to answer the question of the origin of these words satisfactorily, but said "it would be a mistake to ascribe the whole phenomenon to the translation of the Biblical texts",<sup>6</sup> saying that Hellenism in Egypt had been present long before Christianity, and the loanwords seen in Coptic are not confined to the Christian religion but cover all fields of life.<sup>7</sup>

More recent research expresses doubts about the possibility of knowing the spoken reality behind the texts; Sebastian Richter for example says that from the so far extensively studied written texts we have a rather "impressionistic" picture as only "a limited number of written language registers" are represented in them.<sup>8</sup> He also points out, and I completely agree, that it is worth examining the non-literary Coptic texts, as they might bring us closer to the actual vernacular. In such everyday texts, one may expect an unpretentious Coptic style, and examining the differences between these and literary Coptic texts will probably bring some useful results. This expectation was the reason for Georg Steindorff's enthusiasm about the Coptic *documentary* texts edited just at his time: "*Sind sie doch die einzigen uns erhaltenen, größeren koptischen Sprachdenkmäler, die nicht selbst Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen und Arabischen oder doch durch Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen, vornehmlich durch die Bibel, in ihrer Sprachweise beeinflusst sind. Sie zeigen uns zum ersten und letzten Male nach den demotischen Texten einen rein ägyptischen Satzbau.*"<sup>9</sup> However, I would question, together with Sebastian Richter,<sup>10</sup> the idea of a "rein ägyptischer Satzbau" (i.e. free of any Greek influence) in Coptic, as – even taking translations out of the picture – already long before Coptic, Egyptian literacy as well as everyday life had been interwoven

---

<sup>1</sup> I hereby express my gratitude to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for supporting my work through the Bolyai Janos Research Scholarship between 2011-2014.

<sup>2</sup> "Can, indeed, the translation-work of the Biblical books be made responsible for the invasion of Greek words into the Coptic language?" poses the poetic question VÖÖBUS, 1954: 225.

<sup>3</sup> BÖHLIG, 1955: 90.

<sup>4</sup> BÖHLIG, 1955: 90.

<sup>5</sup> NAGEL, 1971: esp. 333-334.

<sup>6</sup> VÖÖBUS, 1954: 225-226.

<sup>7</sup> VÖÖBUS, 1954: 226.

<sup>8</sup> RICHTER, 2009: 2.

<sup>9</sup> STEINDORFF, 1891: 1, cited from RICHTER, 2004: 146 as the ZÄS volume was not available in Budapest.

<sup>10</sup> RICHTER, 2004: 146; also NAGEL, 1971: 348 who warns that even the first Coptic authors were largely influenced by translation literature (e.g. the New Testament).

with Greek. Some results of the present study will show that even the supposedly pure Coptic texts of non-literary writing have traces of Greek influence. And also they will show that the differences are not as simple as the formula 'documentary texts or letters are "rein ägyptisch"', literary Coptic is influenced by Greek.'

The fact that in Demotic hardly any Greek loanwords can be found<sup>11</sup> is not an argument for the opinion that Greek words had not been in use in the Egyptian language and were only taken over with the start and in the course of the translations of the Bible. Demotic, unlike Coptic, was becoming a more and more rigid, almost artificial language register,<sup>12</sup> and had gone out of everyday use after the first century AD and "had gradually become a linguistic register connected to Egyptian religion and magic."<sup>13</sup> And as such it was characterized by 'purism',<sup>14</sup> it was not open to foreign linguistic influence – as opposed to the spoken idiom, which is in general more flexible and more open. In Demotic, the Greek words present are from the expressions of the administration and the army,<sup>15</sup> so they belong to those territories which were evidently dominated by the Greeks in Egypt; and these words are basically only nouns which are the most easily borrowed parts of speech within the group of content words.<sup>16</sup> Now, the first steps towards letting Greek *verbs* into the written Egyptian language can be seen in the Medinet Madi Demotic ostraca, as discussed by Eitan Grossman<sup>17</sup>; here, in the Demotic script Greek verbs written in *Greek* letters are integrated, which is indeed an innovative deed as this is the first time that we see Greek verbs in Demotic texts. These texts make possible the assumption that these verbs were used in the spoken language, hence came the motivation for putting them into writing (eg. *tw.j ir-καταχωρισιν*, *mtw-f ir-αντικατηκωριν*). Had they not been used, writing them down in such everyday, non-literary, non-translational texts<sup>18</sup> does not make much sense.<sup>19</sup>

I think the NT translations themselves show best how much colloquial Egyptian was interwoven with Greek: these translations which were made for missionary purposes,<sup>20</sup> i.e. for the part of the society who did not speak Greek well enough to be able to read the Gospels in Greek,<sup>21</sup> abound with Greek loanwords.<sup>22</sup> Using Greek words in translations prepared for the non-speakers of Greek makes sense only if we assume that these words, or most of them, were part of the used and/or known vocabulary,<sup>23</sup> otherwise the translations are of no great use. Nonetheless, it must be admitted that the translation activity must have brought in some additional words (especially technical terms of Christianity) and enhanced the use of others. Translations did play a significant role in the formulation of Coptic literature, not only by the

<sup>11</sup> CLARYSSE, 1987: 10-12, points out that Demotic vocabulary is remarkably independent of Greek, the few Greek words that do exist in it, belong to the sphere of administration and the army.

<sup>12</sup> HINTZE, 1947: 87.

<sup>13</sup> RICHTER, 2008: 741.

<sup>14</sup> NAGEL, 1971: 333.

<sup>15</sup> CLARYSSE, 1987: 12.

<sup>16</sup> As discussed in HASPELMATH: <http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/staff/haspelmath/pdf/LWT.pdf>; and RICHTER, 2009.

<sup>17</sup> GROSSMAN, 2009: 9

<sup>18</sup> BRESCIANI – PINTAUDI, 1987: 123 and 125.

<sup>19</sup> A similar opinion is expressed by RICHTER (2009: 7): "Their occurrence in the memoranda of a local priest clearly indicates that these verbs formed part of the contemporary *parole*."

<sup>20</sup> NAGEL, 1971: 333.

<sup>21</sup> i.e. "Beyond the boundaries of urban settlements, the boundaries of linguistic hellenization" RICHTER, 2008: 741; also VÖÖBUS, 1954: 213; meaning that the part of the population outside hellenized cities could not read Greek or understand Greek sentences, but: "Greek influence was well established and strong everywhere, and the development of the bureaucratic system inherited from the Ptolemies, coupled with the augmented responsibilities of the local authorities, required a certain degree of knowledge of Greek and literacy even in the smaller towns and villages." RUBENSON, 1995: 97.

<sup>22</sup> On the question of "Fremd-oder Lehnwort" see WEIB, 1966.

<sup>23</sup> cf. NAGEL, 1971: 333.

choice of words and loanwords, but by creating “translational norms” as such, as discussed by Eitan Grossman<sup>24</sup> and as will be shown in the present paper.

When asking the question whether the Greek loans in Coptic were actually part of the spoken language or not, one more fact must be considered: in Syriac the Greek loanwords visibly came to be used in larger quantity in the fifth, and mainly in the sixth and seventh centuries<sup>25</sup> and were rather *Fremdwörter*<sup>26</sup> as indicated by the fact that they were taken over in their *written* rather than *spoken* forms. The Greek words in Coptic, on the other hand, are really loanwords, most of them used for centuries in Egypt before the translation activity, they are of all kinds (e.g., verbs and particles also in great numbers), from the most various fields of life, and were used in the texts in *the way they were pronounced* (i.e. spoken) in the Egyptian Greek of the time.<sup>27</sup>

In the present study, within the problem of loan-verbs, the question of their integration into the Coptic sentence will be addressed.<sup>28</sup> A special group, the so-called verbs of exhorting (i.e. ‘command, order, tell, force, persuade, ask somebody to do something’) has been chosen as the focus of study, as their behaviour, whether used as Greek loans or translated with the Coptic equivalent, seems noteworthy in the Coptic sentence. For the study, texts were first divided into two groups: translated Coptic texts (NT books, *Vita Antonii*, Apocryphon of John) and original Coptic texts (Pachom, Theodore, Horsiese, Shenoute), because earlier examinations<sup>29</sup> have shown that from a syntactic point of view, considerable differences might be observed between the two text types. Maintaining this opinion, a further grouping of texts seemed unavoidable, namely, literary versus non-literary Coptic writing, therefore, letters of monks from the Theban West Bank, and Coptic inscriptions from Nubia have also been studied. The syntactic patterns following these verbs in the different text types will be examined and systematized.

**Greek verbs or Coptic verbs:** All Greek and Coptic verbs of exhorting found in the texts can be seen in Tables 1a and 1b; these two tables show that the first distinction, i.e., translated vs. original Coptic texts, results in more similarities in the vocabulary used: the choice of both Greek and Coptic verbs of exhorting is quite similar, with some differences. The distinction literary (translation and original) vs. non-literary Coptic texts results in more significant differences in the chosen vocabulary in both the Greek and the Coptic verbs – non-literary texts use fewer types of verbs.

Table 1a

ORIGINAL COPTIC TEXTS	TRANSLATED COPTIC TEXTS
<b>Greek loan-verbs:</b> αἰτ(ε)ῖ / εἰτεῖ ἀναγκάζε ἐπειθήσε (ἐπιτάσσε) ἐπιτίμα ὀλιβε κελεύε	<b>Greek loan-verbs:</b> αἰτ(ε)ῖ/ ᾤαιτ(ε)ῖ ἀναγκάζε ἀξιοῦ ἐπιτάσσε ἐπιτίμα

<sup>24</sup> in his paper presented at the Beyond Free Variation: Scribal Repertoires from Old Kingdom to Early Islamic Egypt conference (2009, 14-16 September), in: CROMWELL – GROSSMAN forthcoming

<sup>25</sup> BROCK, 1999: 253.

<sup>26</sup> WEIB, 1966: 194.

<sup>27</sup> WEIB, 1966: 204-205; studying GIGNAC’s example also confirms that; although doubts in Richter 2009: 4/fn.22.

<sup>28</sup> The topic of how Greek loan-verbs are integrated into the Coptic sentence is recently being quite extensively studied by RICHTER 2009, and GROSSMAN 2009 – especially the question whether ‘to  $\bar{\rho}$  or not to  $\bar{\rho}$ ’ (based on Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008).

<sup>29</sup> HASZNOS, 2012

ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ ΠΕΙΘΕ ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΕ ΣΥΜΑΝΕ	ΚΕΛΕΥΕ ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ ΠΕΙΘΕ / ΠΙΘΕ
<b>Coptic original verbs:</b> ⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲥⲟⲡⲥⲡ ⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲥⲁⲛⲉ ⲱⲗⲏⲗ / ⲱⲗⲁ ⲛⲱⲛ	<b>Coptic original verbs:</b> ⲕⲱⲱⲃⲉ / ⲕⲱⲩⲉ ⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲥⲟⲡⲥⲡ ⲧⲱⲃⲉ / ⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲥⲁⲛⲉ ⲱⲗⲏⲗ ⲛⲱⲗⲉ (M) ⲛⲱⲛ / ⲛⲱⲛ ⲕⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲱ

Table 1b

LITERARY COPTIC TEXTS	NON-LITERARY COPTIC TEXTS
<b>Greek loan-verbs:</b> αἰτ(ε)ῖ / εἰ ἀναγκάζε ἀξιοῦ ἐπειθήσε (ἐπιτάσσει) ἐπιτίμα ὀλιβε κελεῦε παραγγεῖλε παρακαλεῖ πείθε προτρέπε σύμανε	<b>Greek loan-verbs:</b> αἰτ(ε)ῖ/ ῥαῖτ(ε)ῖ ἀναγκάζε ἐπιτάσσει κελεῦε παρακαλεῖ πείθε / πιθε
<b>Coptic original verbs:</b> ⲕⲱⲱⲃⲉ ⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲥⲟⲡⲥⲡ ⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲟⲩⲉⲥⲁⲛⲉ ⲱⲗⲏⲗ / ⲱⲗⲁ ⲛⲱⲛ ⲕⲛⲟⲩ ⲕⲱ	<b>Coptic original verbs:</b> ⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲥⲟⲡⲥⲡ ⲛⲱⲛ

The number of types and tokens can be seen in the following tables, again following the two types of distinction:

Table 2a

	<b>All texts</b>
<b>Greek verbs</b>	
Types	12
Tokens	130
<b>Coptic Verbs</b>	
Types	11
Tokens	70

Table 2b: ORIGINAL/TRANSLATED COPTIC

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Translated</b>
<b>Greek verbs</b>		
Types	11	9
Tokens	63	67
<b>Coptic Verbs</b>		
Types	6	10
Tokens	25	45

The tables show that there are more occurrences of the Greek verbs of exhorting than the Coptic ones in all text types detailed here, and looking at the text corpus as a whole; the only subgroup where there are slightly more occurrences of Coptic verbs of exhorting is the original literary texts:

Table 2c: LITERARY/NON-LITERARY COPTIC

	<b>Literary</b>	<b>Non-literary</b>
<b>Greek verbs</b>		
Types	12	6
Tokens	83	47
<b>Coptic Verbs</b>		
Types	9	3
Tokens	63	7

Table 2d

	<b>Original literary</b>
<b>Greek verbs</b>	
Types	9
Tokens	16
<b>Coptic Verbs</b>	
Types	6
Tokens	18

The most surprising rate is displayed by the non-literary texts of Western Thebes (table 3b), in which the Greek verbs of exhorting are in an overwhelming majority (87.04%), despite the fact that they have the fewest *types* of verbs. The most balanced are the Coptic authors, where the rate is almost 50-50%, with Coptic verbs in slight majority (52.95% - 47.05%)!

**Table 3: Frequency/Occurrence of verbs of exhorting**

a) Translation/non-translation division:

	Translated Coptic texts	Original Coptic texts	All
Greek loan-verbs	59.82%	71.59%	<b>65%</b>
Coptic original verbs	40.18%	28.41%	<b>35%</b>

b) Literary/non-literary division:

	All literary texts	<b>Original literary texts</b>	<b>Original non-literary</b>
Greek loan-verbs	56.85%	<b>47.05%</b>	<b>87.04%</b>
Coptic original verbs	43.15%	<b>52.95%</b>	<b>12.96%</b>

Equivalents can be seen in Fig.1, showing 1) what Greek verbs are taken over and which ones are translated in the translated texts where a Greek *Vorlage* is at hand (NT, VA); and 2) which Greek loan-verbs are used side by side with which Coptic equivalents in those texts where several versions or dialects could be studied.

Fig. 1

#### A) The Greek verbs and their equivalents

##### I. in NT:

1) not taken over but translated with the Coptic equivalent in the translations:

δέω (pass and med-pass)	= <b>COΠC TOBZ</b> (M) 'ask so. to do sth.'
ἐρωτάω	= <b>CΠCOΠ COΠC</b> 'ask, beg, etreat'
ἐπερωτάω	= <b>XNOY</b> (S) <b>ΦINE</b> (M) 'ask, entreat'
διαστέλλω	= <b>ZWN</b> 'command'
ἐντέλλω	= <b>ZWN</b> 'command'
ἄγγαρεύω	= <b>KWBCE</b> 'press so. to do sth.'
εἶπω	= <b>XW</b> 'tell so. to do sth.'

2) used in one version but translated in the other:

κελεύω 'command' = **OYEZCAZNE** (in S always); in M normally **KELEGE** and once **EΠITACCE**  
 παρακαλέω 'ask so. to do sth.' = **CΠCOΠ** (S) **TOBZ** (M) in Matthew; however, in Rm it is **ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ**  
 παραγγέλλω 'command, exhort' = **ZON** (M); **ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ** (in S)

ἐπιτιμάω 'tell so. (not) to' = **ZIOYE EZPE** (M); **EΠITIMA** (in S and in M2)

##### II. in the *Vita Antonii*:

ἀναγκάζω 'force, make'	= <b>ΑΝΑΓΚΑΖΕ</b>
κελεύω 'command'	= <b>ΚΕΛΕΓΕ</b>
παραγγέλλω 'command, exhort'	= <b>ΠΑΡΑΓΓ(Ε)ΙΛΕ</b>
	= <b>ΚΕΛΕΓΕ</b>
	= <b>ZWN</b>

παρακαλέω 'ask so. to do sth.' = **ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ** (on some occasions it is translated with **CΠCOΠ** / **COΠC**, but in these cases, it accidentally had no verbal argument; when it means 'to console' it is always translated with **COACX**)

#### B) Equivalents within Coptic, used in the same place in different versions (based on *Apocryphon Joanni* versions, Matthew and John dialects):

<b>EΠITACCE</b>	<b>OYEZCAZNE</b>
<b>EΠITIMA</b>	<b>ZIOYE EZPE</b>
<b>ΚΕΛΕΓΕ</b>	<b>OYEZCAZNE</b>
<b>ΠΑΡΑΓΓΕΙΛΕ</b>	<b>ZWN</b>

The reasons and motivation behind taking over these Greek verbs is in itself worth studying; Coptic equivalents, as we can see here also, did exist and were used extensively so the language did not lack that kind of vocabulary; they are not really technical terms, where the translator would have to be careful not to mistranslate. It is visible that not each verb of exhorting is taken over, some (see Fig 1) are consistently translated. The explanation for that must be that these particular verbs were not known or used by Copts, unlike those taken over

– speakers of Coptic and intended readers of the translated Gospels must have been familiar with these and so it came naturally for the translator to use them. In some cases, differences between the dialects can be observed: in the examined texts, the verb **κελεγε** is never taken over by the S version of Matthew but translated with **ογεζαζνε**, but is always taken over by M, except for one case (Mt 8,18) where it is translated with **επιτασσε**! The latter is not an isolated phenomenon, by the way: on several occasions the Coptic translations have a Greek word different from the one found in the Greek original text,<sup>30</sup> because clearly the translator employs the loanword known and used already in the Egyptian idiom for the given meaning.<sup>31</sup> Some examples from the Greek and Coptic *Vitae Antonii*: for 'strife' the Greek text has ἄμιλλα and the Coptic translates it with the Greek loanword **αγων** throughout the text; the word 'church-building' is used as **κυριακόν** in the Greek version, the Coptic translates it with **εκκλησια**.

Now, regardless of rates, it is obvious that these Greek and Coptic verbs were used side by side and in different versions of the very same text; therefore it is difficult to imagine that the Greek and Coptic verbs belonged to very different registers of the language: for example, Coptic lexical items being less prestigious than Greek ones. Rather, both versions were part of a rather large scale of registers, if we assume that the Coptic authors, the translators of the NT books, and the monks writing letters in Western Thebes belonged to several different layers of late antique Egyptian society. We might assume, however, quite the opposite as well, namely that from a certain point of view they belonged to the same "caste", as they all pursued the 'luxurious activity' of writing.<sup>32</sup> I still believe that regarding also the intended audience, we have rather different registers displayed in these texts. The case of the monks' letters might be especially instructive – representing the spoken language, a less pretentious style.

**Patterns after verbs of exhorting:** Why is class of exhortation verbs noteworthy? Because these verbs raise several fundamental questions, and because the valency of Greek verbs in Coptic is a partly unsolved 'mystery' so far in the scholarly discourse. Now, the verbs meaning "order, command, entreat, force" and so on, act in a certain way in classical Greek, and also in Egyptian, up to Coptic. In classical Greek the regular construction after verbs of exhorting is the infinitive/*accusativus cum infinitivo*:<sup>33</sup>

**Example 1:** **Ξενία τῷ Ἀρκάδι ἤκειν παραγγέλλει ... καὶ τοὺς φυγάδας ἐκέλευσε σὺν αὐτῷ στρατεύεσθαι.**

The infinitive/ *accusativus cum infinitivo* can also be used as subject with certain impersonal verbs or equivalent expressions ('be worthy of, it is necessary, it is appropriate', and the like).<sup>34</sup>

In the language of the Greek NT, on the other hand, it is immediately conspicuous that these verbs and adjectives are frequently followed by a **ἵνα** / **ὅπως**-clause, an originally adverbial clause used to express purpose and not as object of verbs. The Hellenistic period saw an interesting change in the use of **ἵνα**-clauses, specifically, in the frequency of their use and in the syntactic positions they could occupy; they began to be used very often at the expense of

<sup>30</sup> HOPFNER, 1918: 12-13.

<sup>31</sup> WEIB, 1966: 208; FEDER, 2002: 84. the Greek text (BARTELINK, 1994): ἄμιλλα (837A 1) and the Coptic (GARITTE, 1949) **αγων** (1, 6); (841A 11; 841B 6; 844A 20), (3, 11-12; 3, 26; 4, 15).

<sup>32</sup> FUNK 1988: 151.

<sup>33</sup> BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §233; DE WITT BURTON, 1898: §202.

<sup>34</sup> BORNEMANN-RISCH, 1999: §234.



infinitival constructions and to appear in places atypical in classical Attic<sup>35</sup> – as object of certain verbs, in subject position, etc. This phenomenon is almost unknown in classical Greek, but signals a tendency described by Moulton (CITE) as well: ” ἵνα instead of almost any infinitive [(even subject infinitive e.g. Jn 16,7 συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἔγω ἀπέλθω and in 1 Co 9,18)], for exegetical infinitive, in demands after verbs of willing and the like, and also in ecbatic sense, marks the beginning of a process which ended in the disappearance of the infinitive and substitution of *να* with subjunctive in Modern Greek.”<sup>36</sup> It is certainly not my aim to investigate the reasons for that process in the Greek language,<sup>37</sup> It could be the subject of a different paper. At the same time, it should be noted that the use of final clause patterns after these lexical items is not so surprising, as a desired aim is inherent in these verbs.<sup>38</sup>

In the pre-Coptic Egyptian language the most frequently used patterns in object position were the subjunctive-prospective *sdm.f* (later confined to the verb *dj* – in Late Egyptian and Demotic) or the infinitive. Reading the *Coptic* versions of the NT, however, one cannot escape the observation that several final clause patterns are used in the texts, which are not final clauses at all:

### Example 2:

Mt 10,25 (subject)

ⲉⲱ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲃⲟⲩ ⲭⲉⲉⲣⲉⲩⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲟⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲣⲥⲁⲓ

( ἄρκετον τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ )

*It is enough for the disciple to become like his teacher...*

Mt 8, 8 (complementary)

ⲛⲧⲙⲡⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲕⲉⲉⲓ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲛ

( οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς ἵνα ... εἰσέλθῃς )

*(Lord,) I am not worthy to have you come under my roof.*

Mt 4,3 (object)

ⲁⲭⲓⲥ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉⲛⲉⲓⲱⲛⲉⲣⲟⲉⲓⲕ

( Εἰπὲ ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι ἄρτοι γένωνται )

*command these stones to become bread*

These final clause patterns are exactly in the syntactic places discussed above: objects of verbs of exhorting (in other cases, also shown above but not discussed here, subjects, and in

<sup>35</sup> BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §369; HORROCKS, 1997: 75.

<sup>36</sup> MOULTON ET AL., 1963:103 and also 99; also BLASS-DEBRUNNER, 1961: §§ 388, 392.

<sup>37</sup> See for example HORROCKS, 1997: 75: „The extension of finite (subjunctive) clauses introduced by final conjunctions, especially ἵνα, at the expense of infinitival structures: this was possibly connected with the historically wider range of uses of Latin *ut*, e.g. in final and consecutive clauses, indirect commands, and various ‘future-referring’ complement and adjunct structures. Since this process began in the Hellenistic period, however, the most we can say is that contact with Latin may have reinforced and/or accelerated the trend.“

<sup>38</sup> MANDILARAS, 1973: §586 speaks about the ἵνα pattern after verbs of exhorting in the language of the non-literary Greek papyri and thus includes a lot of valuable data; he calls this phenomenon ” ἵνα imperatival depending on a governing verb” and reduces the governing verb to the function of ‘please’, the following clause being in fact and imperative.

complementary and epexegetic positions). They are the translations of the same clause-patterns applied in the Greek *Vorlage*.

Table 4 below shows all occurring patterns after these verbs: the  $\epsilon$ + infinitive construction which is visibly in overwhelming majority, the four types of final clause pattern, the conjunctive, the future conjunctive and the ‘others’, which is either a direct quotation of the command, or an asyndetic perfect 1 (eg. “he commanded and I did”).

The Greek verbs themselves are taken over in some cases, but translated with a Coptic or even Greek equivalent in others, as will be seen later.

Table 4: **Patterns after verbs of exhorting – Greek/Coptic**

	€+(caus) inf	ⲭⲉ(ⲕⲁϭ) - fut 3	Ⲓⲓⲛⲁϭ -fut 3	Ⲓⲓⲛⲁϭ - conj	Ⲓⲓⲛⲁϭ - coni fut	conj	conj fut	other
<b>ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ</b>	Ep 131,10; Ep 142,2; Ep 166, 29; Ep 299,5; Ep 326,16; BG 28, 4; NH III 8, 5; NH II 5, 11; NH IV 7, 26; BG 28, 14; NH III 8, 14; NH II 5, 20; BG 28, 21; NH III 8, 20; NH II 5, 26; NH II 5, 32; NH IV 8, 21; BG 31, 5; NH III 10, 9-10; NH II 6, 33; NH IV 10, 12; Hors, Instr 6, 75, 24-28;	-	-	-		Ep 254,5;	-	Ep 84,37 foll by another pf1;
<b>ⲁⲛⲁⲓⲕⲁⲗⲉ</b>	Ep 59, 35; Ep 277,8; Mt 14,22 (S, M); Sp 15, 30; Young 5, 34b, 52-55; Monast disc 144, 4; Theod 44, 7; Theod 46, 15; VA 82,9;	-	-	-		-	-	Ep 145,6 foll by direct speech ⲭⲉ; VA 66,7 foll by another pf1;
<b>ⲁⲗⲓⲟⲩ</b>	VA 8,4; VA 11,1; VA 16,1; VA 48,2; VA 49,6; VA 50,5; VA 51,1; VA 57,1; VA 58,2; VA 58,4; VA 60,5; VA 60,7; VA 61,1; VA 62,2; VA 63,1; VA 67,3; VA 70,3; VA 81,6; VA 82,5; VA 84,3; VA 85,1;	VA 54,1; VA 90,3;						
<b>ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲁϭⲉ</b>	Mt 8,18 (M);	-	-	-		Ep 406,6;	Mt 14,28 (M2; 1st sing foll imp)	-
<b>ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲓⲙⲁ</b>	Monast disc 119, 7;	Mt 12,16 (S); Mt 20,31 (S);	Mt 12,16 (M);	-		-	-	-
<b>ⲑⲁⲓⲃⲉ</b>	Monast disc 144, 7;	-	-	-		-	-	-
<b>ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ</b>	Ep 133,5; NH III 17, 17; Mt 14,9 (M); Mt 14,19 (M); Mt 18,25 (M); Mt 27,58 (M); VA 64,4; VA 46,3;	-	-	-		-	Mt 14,28 (M; 1st sing foll imp)	Mt 27,64 (M) optative; Mt 19,7 (M2) foll by opt in direct quot;
<b>ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓⲗⲉ</b>	Mt 15,35 (S); Ad phil 61, 12; VA 68,2; VA 91,7;	-	-	-		-	-	-
<b>ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ</b>	Rm 12,1; Rm 16,17; Exc 29b, 29-29.a16; Theod 48, 7-8; Theod 56, 6;	Ep 172,6 (fut2); Ep 173,5 (fut2); Ep,200,3 (fut2); Ep				Ep 163, 4; Ep 165,1-2; Ep 165,6; Ep 165,13; Ep	Ep 337,4;	Ep 401,5 foll by imp; Ep 404,v.9 foll by

	TT65 99/I.D/25, 2-3; TT65 02/I.D/6, r. 2; Ep 106,4; Ep 277,5; Ep 199,5-7; Ep 271,9; Ep 307,3; Ep 277,16; Ep 348,20; Ep 359,7; VA 13,4;	217,5 (fut2); Ep 266,5 (fut2); Ep 282,6 (fut2); Ep 328,5 (fut2); Ep 376,4 (fut3); Ep 436,5 (fut2);				165,15; Ep 172,11; Ep 174,3; Ep 255,6; Ep 257,4; Ep 340,4; Ep 386,5; Ep 458,10;		imp;
<b>ΠΕΙΘΕ</b>	Ep 141,19; Mt 27,20(M2); Monast disc 149, 26; Theod 59, 1-2;	Mt 27,20 (S);	Mt 27,20 (M);	-		-	-	-
<b>ΠΡΟΤΡΕΠΕ</b>	Young 6-7, 38b, 39-40;							
<b>ΣΥΜΑΝΕ</b>	Hors, Instr 5, 73, 21-22							
<b>ΚΩΦΕ</b>		Mt 27,32 (S, M);						Mt 27,32 (M2) foll by another pf1;
<b>ΣΟΠΣ</b>	Rm 1,10; Theod 47, 34; Theod 50, 33; Hors, Instr 7, 79, 1-2; Hors, Reg, 86, 4-5;	Mt 9,38 (S); Jn 17,15 (S, L); Jn 19,31 (S,L); Jn 19,38 (S,L); Ad phil 59, 2				Ep 199,8; Ep 351,14;	Ep 199,14 after imp;	
<b>ΣΟΠΣΠ</b>	Jn 4,40 (S,L); Monast disc 139, 14;	Mt 8,34 (S); Mt 14,36 (S); Jn 4,47 (S,L);				TT65 02/I.D/6, v. 1-2;		
<b>ΤΩΒΖ</b>	Hors, Reg, 97, 17-19;	Mt 9,38 (M); Mt 8,34 (M);		Mt 14,36 (M);			Mt 9,38 (M2) after imp;	
<b>ΟΥΕΖΣΑΖΝΕ</b>	BG 41, 12-13; Mt 8,18 (S); Mt 14,9 (S); Mt 14,19 (S); Mt 14,28 (S); Mt 18,25 (S); Mt 27,58 (S); Mt 27,64 (S); Theod 53, 11;							
<b>ΨΙΝΕ</b>	Mt 16,1 (M)							
<b>ΨΛΗΛ</b>	Young 28, 169, 37-38; Young 5, 34a, 27; Young 21, 130, 19-21; Ad phil 45, 20; Theod 53, 21; Hors, L, 65, 21; Ep 200,2;							
<b>ΖΙΟΥΕ</b>		Mt 20,31 (M);						
<b>ΖΩΝ</b>	Mt 15,35 (M); Mt 19,7 (S,M); Ep 297,3; Sp 2, 27; Sp 8, 28; Sp 22, 8; VA 8,2; VA 86,3;	Mt 16,20 (S,M); Jn 15,17 (S); Sp 18, 14-15 <sup>39</sup> ;						Ep 431,4 foll by direct speech <b>xe</b> ;
<b>ΧΝΟΥ</b>	Mt 16,1 (S);							
<b>ΧΩ</b>		Mt 4,3 (S,M); Mt 20,21 (S);		Mt 20,21 (M);	Mt 20,21 (M2);			

<sup>39</sup> Questionable: maybe final?

## I. The final clause patterns

Among the final clause patterns the following can be found in the texts: **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϥ** / **ⲭⲉ**+fut3 or 2; **ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ**+ fut 3; **ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ** + conj; and once the **ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ** + fut conj. Starting with the latter three:

**I.1. The ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ-group:** That conjunction naturally originates from the Greek final conjunction ἵνα and was probably mixed together with Coptic **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϥ**, hence the final -ϥ, and is called therefore by Professor Nagel 'Kunstwort'.<sup>40</sup> Now, this *Kunstwort* is only applied in the M dialect (both Scheide and Schoyen), and is followed twice by future 3, twice by the conjunctive, and once in the Schoyen Codex (Mt 20,21) by the future conjunctive:

Ex 3:

Mt 20,21

Codex Schoyen-version: ⲫⲟⲩⲉⲱⲧⲣⲉⲕⲭⲁϥ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ ⲧⲁⲣⲏⲡⲁⲱⲏⲣⲏ ⲉ̅ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ

Codex Scheide-version: ⲁⲭⲓϥ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲁⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲥⲛⲉⲩ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ

Εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου

*Permit these two sons of mine to sit, (one at your right hand and one at your left, in your kingdom.)*

The pattern with the Third Future follows the Greek verbs **ἐπιτίμα** and **πείθε**:

Ex 4:

Mt 12,16

M: ⲕⲁⲩⲉⲡⲓⲧⲓⲙⲁ ⲛⲉⲩ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲛⲉⲩⲟⲩⲁⲛⲓⲩⲉ ⲉⲃⲁⲗ

Greek: καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν

*But he sternly warned them not to make him known.*

Mt 27,20

M: ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲩϥ ⲁⲉ ⲙⲛ ⲛⲉⲡⲣⲉϥⲃⲩⲧⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲕⲁⲩⲓⲡⲏⲱⲉ ⲙⲡⲓⲛⲱⲉ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ ⲉⲟⲩⲉⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲛⲃⲁⲣⲁⲃⲃⲁϥ

Greek: ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν

*But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds to ask for Barabbas*

The pattern with the conjunctive follows the Coptic verbs **ⲧⲱⲃⲭ** and **ⲭⲱ**:

Ex 5:

Mt 14,36

M: ⲛⲁⲩⲧⲱⲃⲭ ⲙⲙⲁⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲥⲉⲭⲉⲭ ⲙⲙⲉⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲗⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲉⲩⲕⲁⲓⲧⲉ

Greek: παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μόνον ἅψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ

*They begged him if they could only touch the edge of his cloak*

Mt 20,21

M: ⲁⲭⲓϥ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ ⲛⲧⲉⲡⲁⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲥⲛⲉⲩ ⲕⲓⲛⲁϥ

---

<sup>40</sup> Personal communication 2001, Bonn.

Greek: εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου

*Permit these two sons of mine to sit, (one at your right hand and one at your left, in your kingdom.)*

The only difference between them is that the Third Future pattern follows a Greek verb in both cases, whereas, the Conjunctive pattern follows a Coptic verb – can it be a determining factor?

It is interesting to note that in pure final clauses only the **ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲥ** + future 3 pattern occurs in M, the **ⲁⲓⲛⲁⲥ** + Conjunctive pattern is confined to object and complementary/epexegetic positions (the latter not presented here).

### **I.2. The **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** / **ⲭⲉ** + fut3 or 2 pattern:**

It can be seen in Table 4 that basically the same syntactic patterns follow the Greek and the Coptic verbs. The **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** / **ⲭⲉ** –pattern is also applied after both Greek loans and Coptic verbs, but it occurs most frequently in the NT translations, and after the Coptic translations of Greek verbs of exhorting:

Ex 6:

Mt 16,20

Τότε διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἰπωσιν

S: **ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲱ ⲛⲏⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲛⲏⲉⲅⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲉⲗⲗⲁⲅ**

M: **ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲓⲉ ⲁⲓⲣⲱⲛ ⲉⲧⲁⲧⲱ ⲛⲏⲉⲓⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲏⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲏⲉⲅⲭⲁⲥ ⲁⲗⲁⲧⲏ ⲁⲓ**

*Then he instructed his disciples not to tell anyone*

The pattern occurs naturally also after the Greek loan-verb when the original has a clause pattern, but interestingly enough, the Greek verbs taken over in the Coptic translations tend to stand in the Greek version with the infinitive construction and this is followed in the translations. The verbs **ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ** and **ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲓⲙⲁ** are the ones taken over rather than translated and followed by the clause pattern:

Ex 7:

Mt 27, 20

S: **ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲅⲥ ⲁⲉ ⲙⲏ ⲛⲉⲡⲣⲉⲥⲃⲱⲧⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲁⲅⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ⲙⲡⲓⲙⲏⲩⲱⲉ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲅⲉⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲛⲃⲁⲣⲁⲃⲃⲁⲥ**

Greek: οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν

*But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds to ask for Barabbas*

This loan-verb is used in the *original* texts as well, and there it is always followed by the infinitive construction:

Ex 8:

Theodore, *Instruction*

59, 1-2

**ⲉⲗⲁⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ⲛⲓⲙⲟⲓ ⲛⲟⲓⲡⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲓⲙⲉⲥⲧⲉⲛⲟⲅⲱⲩ ⲧⲏⲣⲱ ⲛⲡⲓⲁⲱⲛ**

*the Saviour persuaded him to scorn all this age's desires*

Shenoute, *Monast disc* 149, 26

ΝΕΜΕΝΕΨΠΕΙΘΕ ΝΙΜΟΟΥΠΕ ΕΤΡΕΥΣΑΖΩΟΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΖΩΒ ΝΙΜ ΕΘΟΟΥ

*... was able to persuade them to remove themselves from all bad things...*

P.Mon.Ep 141,19

ΜΠΩΠΙΘΕ ΕΤΡΕΨΕΠΤΡΗΝΗ ΝΑϠ

*he was not to be persuaded to accept peace*

The case is the same with **ΕΠΙΤΙΜΑ**:

Ex 9:

Mt 12,16

ΑΓΕΠΙΤΙΜΑ ΝΑΥ ΧΕΚΑΣ ΝΙΝΕΥΟΓΟΝΖΩ ΕΒΟΛ

καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν

*But he sternly warned them not to make him known.*

Mt 20,31

ΠΙΗΗΨΕ ΔΕ ΑΓΕΠΙΤΙΜΑ ΝΑΥ ΧΕΚΑΣ ΕΥΕΚΑΡΩΟΥ

Ο δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν

*The crowd scolded them to get them to be quiet.*

Shenoute, *Monast disc* 119,7

ΣΕΕΠΙΤΙΜΑ ΝΑΝ ΕΤΗΚΑΤΑΛΛΕΙ

*they warn us not to slander*

In the translations, following the Greek *Vorlage*, the final clause pattern is applied, whereas in the original writing, be it literary or non-literary, the infinitive construction is used. It is also noteworthy, although this topic will not be discussed here, that the valency of the Greek verb, originally the dative case, is preserved in Coptic when the loan-verb **ΕΠΙΤΙΜΑ** is integrated into a sentence, in the original writing as well.

Now, the Coptic verb **СОПСІ** (in M **ΤΟΒΖ**) is used in translated (for παρακαλέω or δέομαι) and original writing as well, but with different patterns: in the Coptic (S; M= **ΤΟΒΖ**) NT it occurs with the final clause pattern (Mt 8, 34 and 14, 36: following Greek παρακάλω plus final clause; in Mt 9, 38 following δέηθητε plus final clause) and also with the infinitive construction (in Rm 12, 1 and 16, 17 παρακαλέω/παρακαλεῖ in Greek and Coptic), always copying the Greek pattern!

In the original literary texts, on the other hand, the verbs **СОПСІ** /**СОПĒ** and **ΤΟΒΖ** only occur with the infinitive construction;<sup>41</sup> in original non-literary followed by the conjunctive and the future conjunctive, see later.

In Shenoute it is especially nice to see this verb and all the others with related meaning always used with the infinitive construction, for example:

Ex 10:

*Monast disc* 139, 14

ΑΥΩ ΤΗΑΣΕΠΣΩΠΟΥ ΕΤΡΕΥΚΩ ΝΑΙ ΕΒΟΛ

<sup>41</sup> With the one exception described earlier, where Shenoute quotes Mt 9, 38.

*and I will ask them to forgive me*

and once, unexpectedly, the **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ** clause appears in this environment because the author quotes from a translated text, the Gospel of Matthew:

*Ad phil* 59, 2 (quotation from Mt 9, 38):

ⲥⲡⲉⲛⲭⲟⲓⲉⲥ ⲙⲡⲱⲗⲥ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲓⲉⲛⲉⲭⲉⲣⲓⲁⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲉⲣⲱⲗⲥ

quoting: ⲥⲡⲉⲛⲭⲟⲓⲉⲥ ⲃⲉ ⲙⲡⲱⲗⲥ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲓⲉⲛⲉⲭⲉⲣⲓⲁⲧⲏⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲡⲉⲣⲱⲗⲥ

the original Greek of which is: δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἔργατας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ

*Therefore ask the Lord of the harvest to send out workers into his harvest.*

So evidently, in the Coptic translations, the Greek verb might or might not be taken over, but independently of that, the syntactic pattern following the verb of exhorting is determined by the Greek *Vorlage*: if there is a final clause pattern, the Coptic translator will copy that, if an infinitive is used, the Coptic has **ⲉ+** infinitive. In the S version of Matthew, John and Romans, there is no deviation from the given Greek pattern; M differs twice and L once from the Greek *Vorlage*. In the *Vita Antonii* the verb ἄξιόω is by far the most frequent verb of exhorting (26 occurrences as opposed to 10 from all others), and except for one case (where the verb "ask" is left out 70,2) it is taken over by the Coptic translator, and that is the case with other Greek verbs of exhorting in that text. As to patterns, there is only one occurrence in the Greek text of the **ⲓⲛⲱ+subj** final clause pattern and that is after ἄξιόω (84,4), but this sentence is unfortunately missing from the Coptic version (maybe used a slightly different original?); otherwise basically the infinitive (or *acc cum inf*) is applied, which is followed quite consistently by the translator. On 6 occasions of the 36, the Coptic pattern deviates from the Greek original; in two cases (54,1; 90,3) the pattern after ἄξιόω in the Coptic version is the final clause pattern **ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ+fut3**, although the Greek has the infinitive. So the VA is different from the examined NT books in several respects: the Greek text itself does not favour the final clause pattern after the verbs of exhorting, and the Coptic text translates the infinitive with the final clause pattern twice, which does not happen in the NT books, and on 4 other occasions it deviates from the Greek, which is noteworthy given the pattern adherence of the Sahidic NT (the *Vita* is of course also Sahidic) where out of 31 occurrences no deviation is found. This difference in the adherence to the source text can be explained with the type of text: one being Biblical, the other a *Vita*. It is very important to bear in mind with the Coptic NT translations that the Greek "text is an authoritative source, given, ever-present, decoded (but also interpreted and often imitated) by the author of the target text; the other text is created on the basis of the source text".<sup>42</sup> Peter Nagel points out that as opposed to the NT translations: "*Die koptischen Übersetzer gingen zuweilen recht frei mit ihrer Vorlage um, wenn es kein kanonischer Text war.*"<sup>43</sup> So the endeavour of the Coptic NT translators is to create a precise translation, following the original as closely as possible, giving the target text some uniformity and creating translational norms (Grossman, mentioned earlier). This 'precision and uniformity' is best shown in the present material in the S texts, which are the most pattern-strict and consistent. It is most likely undesirable to have a large number of translation varieties for the NT books, with each translator having his own personal favourite patterns for the final clauses, clauses of result, etc. Examining (in my PhD dissertation) the final clauses, object and subject clauses, complementary clauses, and clauses of result in these NT books, dialect M showed most variety in its choice of patterns and most deviations from the Greek

<sup>42</sup> SHISHA-HALEVY, 1990: 100/fn.4.

<sup>43</sup> NAGEL, 1998: 41.



original, thus proving to be the most independent translation. After the verbs of exhorting, to a certain Greek pattern it has more than one solution, for example a ἵνα-clause, while also a clause in M, can be **ⲭⲉ** future 3, **ⲭⲉⲕⲉⲥ** future 3, **ⲕⲓⲛⲁⲥ** future 3, or **ⲕⲓⲛⲁⲥ** conjunctive/fut conj.

In the mentioned clause types:

S deviates in 3.33% of the cases (12 times out of 360)

L deviates in 8.51% of the cases (12 times out of 141)

M deviates in 14.29% of the cases (21 times out of 147).

The motivation for a very literal, in our case let us call it pattern-to-pattern, translation of the NT books is the sacred nature of the source text whose language is considered inspired and sacred (cf. Jerome: 'where even word order is a mystery'<sup>44</sup>), thus has to be put into any other language very precisely,<sup>45</sup> "to bring the reader to the original" and not "the original to the reader".<sup>46</sup> Just as in the case of the Hebrew Old Testament, whose Greek translation was also "accepted as inspired"<sup>47</sup> and was not to be altered:<sup>48</sup> as the Aristeas Epistle puts it: 'Ἐπεὶ καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως διηρνήνευται καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἡκριβωμένος, καλῶς ἔχον ἔστιν ἵνα διαμείνη ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα, καὶ μὴ γένηται μηδεμία διασκευή<sup>49</sup> ...since so excellent and sacred and accurate a translation had been made, it was only right that it should remain as it was and no alteration should be made in it.<sup>50</sup>

It is thus a chosen technique, not some kind of incompetence in Coptic stylistics and syntax, to copy the given Greek patterns; the translators knowingly create in many cases non-Coptic-like but necessarily very Greek-like patterns, and thus sentences, in their texts. As Sebastian Brock points out, the translator has to make a decision at the beginning of his work about what technique he will follow, *sensus de sensu* or *verbum e verbo*; the criteria for his choice are 1. the nature of the text he is translating, 2. the relative prestige of the two languages concerned and 3. the extent to which the source language is still widely known.<sup>51</sup> In the bilingual land of Egypt, Greek was naturally known by everyone, though evidently not spoken by all the population and not on the same level. The prestige of Greek was quite understandably high, the fact that it is the language of the Gospels obviously added to that in the eyes of the Christians. The nature of the text in this case needs no further comment – from all these it inevitably follows that very literal, or better, pattern-to-pattern translations are made. With this very close translation of the sacred text of the New Testament, with all its syntactic grecisms then, the Coptic text becomes marked and another sacred text with its sacred language is born.<sup>52</sup>

The point I would like to make is that clearly, the final clause pattern in object position after verbs of exhorting came to be used in the course of translating the Greek texts of – among others – the NT. As discussed earlier, the final clause pattern taking the place of the infinitive constructions and becoming widespread in object position (among others) is a

---

<sup>44</sup> In his Letter to Pammachius, cited from BROCK, 1979: 69-70.

<sup>45</sup> "This is a situation of "texts in contact" (...) as well as "languages in contact"." SHISHA-HALEVY, 1990: 100/fn.4.

<sup>46</sup> BROCK, 1979: 73.

<sup>47</sup> BROCK, 1979: 72.

<sup>48</sup> Just as the original Scriptures are not to be altered, cf. Deut 4, 2.

<sup>49</sup> *AristEpist* 310, 3-6.

<sup>50</sup> English translation from CHARLES, 1913.

<sup>51</sup> BROCK, 1979: 70-74.

<sup>52</sup> cf. FÖLDVÁRY, 2008, writing about the translations of the Old Testament and the hebraisms therein, which are thus marked and build up a sacred language.

phenomenon seen in the Greek language development and well attested in the NT. It is, naturally, not used to the same extent in different Greek texts: Mt uses the infinitive constructions and final clause patterns in a more balanced way, whereas in Jn the final clause pattern is clearly dominant, in the *Vita Antonii* on the other hand, the final clause pattern in the Greek version appears but once; and unfortunately we do not have the original Greek of the Apocryphon of John where only the infinitive construction appears, the reason for that is thus unclear: did the Greek original have only infinitives in this position or are the translations responsible for that?

The appearance of the final clause pattern in object position is rather un-Egyptian, with no roots detectable in pre-Coptic, and suspiciously overwhelming and typical in translated Coptic, and mostly in the strongly 'Vorlage-dependent' NT translations. The Coptic authors visibly prefer to use the infinitive construction, and there is one sole questionable occurrence in Pachom. So in the use of the verbs of exhorting there is syntactical difference between translated and original texts, and the latter seem to display a more "rein ägyptischer Satzbau" to refer again back to Georg Steindorff's opinion. If we follow Georg Steindorff's vein of thinking and our own instinct, we would expect the monks' letters (being non-literary, non-translation) to be even purer Egyptian, however, we will partly be disappointed. Their patterns are partly 'purer' but partly closer to the translated texts:

The loan-verb **παράκαλει** occurs only twice in Rm, otherwise translated in the examined NT books, however, it is applied in original writings very frequently, in literary texts to a lesser degree, but rather extensively in the non-literary texts. In Coptic authors the verb is followed by the infinitive construction as expected and presented earlier, however, in our monks' writings this loan-verb (and only this) is followed by the final clause pattern **ⲭⲉⲕⲁϥ**+fut 2 (once fut 3) on 9 occasions out of the 34 occurrences of this verb. The final clause pattern only occurs in the texts of the Epiphanius monastery from the examined texts. Table 5 shows all the different text types and their rates of the various patterns:

Table 5: the rates of the various patterns after verbs of exhorting

	<b>Greek</b>	<b>Translated Coptic</b>	<b>Original literary</b>	<b>Orig. non- lit.</b>	<b>Total Coptic</b>
Final clause pat.	27.42%	28.57%	4.88%	16.67%	21.5%
Inf. constr.	70.97%	65.18%	95.12%	38.89%	63%
Conjunctive	.....	-	-	31.48%	8.5%
Future conj	.....	2.68%	-	3.70%	2.5%
Other	1.61%	3.57%	-	9.26%	4.5%

Considering firstly only the final clause patterns vs. infinitive patterns: one has to remember that the 4.88% in original literary texts comes from NT quotations and one questionable place; in non-literary the final clause pattern occurs solely after the Greek loan **παράκαλει**, whereas in the translation of the NT it comes after several Greek and Coptic verbs of exhorting; and, in line with what has been said about the translation technique and the Coptic translations of the NT, a striking similarity can be observed between the percentages of final clause patterns and infinitive constructions in Greek texts and translated Coptic; the rate of final clauses in the monks' writings is much lower than that.

Looking at the other patterns: the future conjunctive and the “other” in translated texts comes exclusively from the M versions of Matthew. In the monks’ letters, another very frequent pattern after these verbs is the conjunctive, used exclusively in that text group in the examined texts, although once in M Matthew the first person singular conjunctive is used, following an imperative of a verb of exhorting, so it can be both conjunctive and future conjunctive:

Ex 11:

Mt 14,28

M: **ΚΕΛΕΥΕ ΝΕΙ ΝΤΑΕΙ ΕΡΕΤΚ ΖΙΧΝ ΜΜΑΥ**

Greek: **κέλευσόν με ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σε ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα**

*order me to come to you on the water*

P.Mon.Ep. 165,1-3

**ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ ἨΠΑΧΘΕΙC ἸΕΙΩΤ ΝῒCΖΑΙ ΟΥΕΠΙCΤΟΛΗ**

*order my fatherly lord to write a letter*

P.Mon.Ep. 199,8

**ΕΤΡΕΚΣΕΠC ΠΙΝΟΥΤΕ ΖΑΡΟΙ ΝῒΡΠΕΦΝΑ ΝῒΜΑΙ**

*that you ask God for me to mercy me*

It is interesting that in S, only in the monks’ writings was the conjunctive found in this position – Stern already remarks<sup>53</sup> about the conjunctive as object that in this position S prefers the **ε**+infinitive construction, while in B the conjunctive is “*zwar das gewöhnliche*”.<sup>54</sup> The difference between literary S on the one hand and non-literary S, and dialect M on the other in the use of the conjunctive is again interesting.<sup>55</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Examining the verbs of exhorting in a variety of Coptic texts, it has been found that Greek and Coptic verbs are both used in all text types, they occur basically side by side. In all of them the frequency of Greek verbs is larger than that of the Coptic versions, except in Coptic authors who apply the Greek and Coptic verbs in a very balanced manner. Especially interesting is the examined corpus of monks’ writings from Western Thebes, where the Greek loan-verbs are in an overwhelming majority, and their difference from Coptic authors.

2. The most frequent pattern used after the verbs of exhorting, whether Greek loan or Coptic original, is the **ε**+ infinitive construction, however, another widely applied pattern is the final clause pattern. This is applied most frequently in the NT translations among the examined texts and due to the translation technique occurs almost in the same percentage as in the Greek original. This is a deeper influence than mere translation technique, as the final clause pattern in such object position has no predecessor in the Egyptian language, and probably came to be used there in the course of the translations.

<sup>53</sup> STERN, 1880: §§440, 443; §445

<sup>54</sup> §445

<sup>55</sup> The conjunctive occurs in real object position after certain verbs (the exhorting and/or final *Anklang* is a prerequisite): Already in Late Egyptian it is attested after **ḥn**, **ṭbḥ**, see VOLTEN, 1964: 64-65; and it is introduced as the “sequencing prospective „that”-form” role of the conjunctive by SHISHA-HALEVY as “content object to a special inventory of verbs (**ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ ΟΥΘΩ** etc.)”, SHISHA-HALEVY, 1995: 313; the conjunctive occurs in complementary position in Pachom and in the L NT translations not very frequently; the conjunctive occurs in subject position several times in the M dialect.

3. Besides the Coptic translations, the non-literary texts from Western Thebes also apply the final clause pattern in object position but only after one Greek loan-verb **ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ**. What can be the explanation for that? Since here we cannot argue with the Greek Vorlage that the writer had to follow.
4. The Coptic authors use the Greek and Coptic verbs of exhorting in the most balanced way, and do not apply the final clause pattern after them. Thus, their language seems to be the most conservative and Greek-independent. Noteworthy is the difference between the two original text types in both chosen vocabulary and pattern – is it due to the time difference between them, or to the stylistic differences between literary Coptic and colloquial? The language of the monks' writings is beyond doubt much less eloquent or elaborate than that of the authors, the content is of course also much simpler – it can be observed in the choice of words, their variety is smaller. One might assume that the language of the main reading of the monks, the NT, had such influence on their style, but why not on the authors' style then?
5. As to verb borrowing and linguistic borrowing as such: whereas I think that most of the verbs found in the texts were used and/or known by most of the Coptic speakers and are the result of the bilingual situation and only secondarily of the translations, in the case of some syntactic patterns, I tend to think that the translation activity, and the chosen/obligatory translation technique played the main role in their appearance in the Coptic sentence.
6. The neutral character of dialect S is further proven here by its attitude towards translating the patterns after verbs of exhorting: it is the most pattern-strict, consistent in its choice of pattern, and most standardizing, with least variety – as opposed to M.

### Abbreviation of Texts:

Mt=Gospel of Matthew (S:Sahidic; M: Mesokemic, Codex Scheide; M2: Mesokemic, Codex Schoyen)

Jn=Gospel of John

Rm=Epistle to the Romans

The four text-versions of *The Apocryphon of John*: NH II= Nag Hammadi Codex II; NH III=Nag Hammadi Codex III; NH IV= Nag Hammadi Codex IV; BG= Berlin Codex

VA=*Vita Antonii*

Ep (in the table) / P.Mon.Ep. (in the text) =Letters from the Epiphanius Monastery

TT65= Letters from Theban Tomb 65 (Cyriacus Monastery)

Sp= Pachom, *Instruction Concerning a Spiteful Monk*

Exc= Pachom, *Excerpta*

Hors, Inst= Horsiese, *Instructions*

Hors, Reg= Horsiese, *Regulations*

Hors, L= Horsiese, *Letters*

Young 5; 6-7; 21; 28= selected texts from Shenoute in Young's publication (1993)

Monast disc= Shenoute, *De eis qui e monasterio discesserunt*

Ad phil= Shenoute, *Ad philosophum gentilem*

Theod= Theodore, *Instruction 3*

### Bibliography

ALAND, BARBARA – ALAND, KURT –KARAVIDOPOULOS, JOHANNES – MARTINI, CARLO MARIA – METZGER, BRUCE M. (eds.), 1994: *The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1994<sup>4</sup>

ARANDA PEREZ, GONZALO, 1984: *El evangelio de San Mateo en copto sahidico*, Madrid

BARTELINK, G. J. M., 1994: *Athanasius: Vie d'Antoine*, Sources Chrétiennes 400, Paris: Éditions du Cerf

BLASS, FRIEDRICH – DEBRUNNER, ALBERT, 1961: *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, transl. by R.W. Funk, Chicago and London

BORNEMANN, EDUARD – RISCH, ERNST, 1999: *Görög nyelvtan (transl.by Mayer, P.)*, Budapest 1999 (*Griechische Grammatik von Eduard Bornemann unter Mitwirkung von Ernst Risch*, Frankfurt am Main 1978)

BÖHLIG, ALEXANDER, 1955: "Beiträge zur Form griechischer Wörter im Koptischen" *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 80, 90-97

BRESCIANI, EDDA – PINTAUDI, ROSARIO, 1987: "Textes démotico-grecs et greco-démotiques des ostraca de Medinet Madi: un probleme de bilinguisme" in: Vleeming, S. P. (ed.), *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography*, Leuven: Peeters

- BROCK, SEBASTIAN, 1979: "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20, 69-87, N.C.
- BROCK, SEBASTIAN, 1999: *From Ephrem to Romanos. Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*, Ashgate: Variorum
- CHARLES, R.H. (ED.), 1913: *The Letter of Aristeas*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press
- CLARYSSE, WILLY, 1987: "Greek Loan-words in Demotic" in: Vleeming, S. P. (ed.), *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography*, Leuven: Peeters
- CRUM, WALTER EWING – EVELYN WHITE, HUGH G., 1926: *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes, Part II. Coptic Ostraca and Papyri. Greek Ostraca and Papyri*, New York
- DE WITT BURTON, ERNEST, 1898: *Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek*, Chicago, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition
- ELANSKAYA, ALLA I., 1991: *Coptic Literary Texts of the Pushkin State Fine Arts Museum in Moscow*, Studia Aegyptiaca XIII, Budapest
- FEDER, FRANK, 2002: *Biblia Sahidica. Ieremias, Lamentationes (Threni), Epistula Ieremiae at Baruch*, TU 147, Walter de Gruyter
- FEDER, FRANK, 2006: „Die „Gräzität“ koptischer Bibelübersetzungen. Wege der Übertragung heiliger Schriften“, *Lingua Aegyptia* 14, 301-310.
- FÖLDVÁRY, MIKLÓS I., 2008: "Szent nyelv vagy szent nyelvek?", [www.foldvary.eoldal.hu/cikkek](http://www.foldvary.eoldal.hu/cikkek)
- FUNK, WOLF-PETER, 1988: 'Dialects Wanting Homes: a Numerical Approach to the early Varieties of Coptic', in Fisiak, J. (ed.), *Historical Dialectology: Regional and Social*, Mouton de Gruyter
- GARITTE, GÉRARD, 1949: *S. Antonii Vitae versio Sahidica*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 117, Scriptores coptici IV, 1, Paris
- GIGNAC, FRANCIS THOMAS, 1976-81: *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, 2 vols. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 55, Milan
- GODLEWSKI, WŁODZIMIERZ, 1986: *Deir el-Bahari V, Le monastère de St Phoibammon*, Warszawa

- GROSSMAN, EITAN, 2009: 'Grammatical Variation and Language Change: the Case of Greek Verb Lexemes in Coptic', (yet) unpublished paper in Oxford: Beyond Free-Variation: Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the Old Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period (University College, Oxford, Sept. 14-16 2009)
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN s.a., *Loanword Typology: Steps toward a Systemic Cross-Linguistic Study of Lexical Borrowability* (<http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/staff/haspelmath/pdf/LWT.pdf>)
- HINTZE, FRITZ, 1947: 'Die Haupttendenzen der ägyptischen Sprachentwicklung', *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 1/3.
- HINTZE, FRITZ, 1950: „Konversion“ und „analytische Tendenz“ in der ägyptischen Sprachentwicklung, *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 4.
- HOPFNER, THEODOR, 1918: *Über Form und Gebrauch der griechischen Lehnwörter in der koptisch-sahidischen Apophthegmenversion*, Wien
- HORNER, GEORGE (ed.), 1969: *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect* vols 7, Osnabrück: Otto Zeller
- HORROCKS, GEOFFREY, 1997: *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*, London and New York
- JOHNSON, JANET, 1976: *The Demotic Verbal System*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 38, Chicago
- JUNGE, FRIEDRICH, 1996: *Einführung in die Grammatik des Neuägyptischen*, Wiesbaden
- LAYTON, BENTLEY, 2004: *A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary. Sahidic Dialect* (Porta Linguarium Orientalium 20), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (second edition)
- LEFORT, LOUIS THÉOPHIL, 1948: “ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲥ dans le NT sahidique” *Le Muséon* 61, 65-73
- LEFORT, LOUIS THÉOPHIL, 1950: „Gréco-copte“ in: *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*, Boston: The Byzantine Institute
- LEFORT, LOUIS THÉOPHIL, 1956: *Oeuvres de S. Pachom et de ses disciples*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 159, Scriptorum coptici 23, Louvain

- LEIPOLDT, JOHANNES, 1908: *Sinuthii archimandritae vita et opera omnia III*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 42, Scriptores coptici 4, Louvain
- LOPRIENO, ANTONIO, 1995: *Ancient Egyptian. A Linguistic Introduction*, Cambridge University Press
- MANDILARAS, B., 1973: *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*, Athens
- METZGER, BRUCE M., 1977: *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford
- MINK, GERD, 1972: *Die koptischen Versionen des Neuen Testaments* in: K. ALAND (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung 5, 160-299.
- MORENZ, SIEGFRIED, 1952: "Die ⲛⲟⲓ-Konstruktion als sprachliche und stilistische Erscheinung des Koptischen", *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 52, 1-15.
- MOULTON, JAMES HOPE – HOWARD, WILBERT FRANCIS – TURNER, NIGEL, 1963: *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 5 vols, Edinburgh 1906-1976 (I am always referring to vol. 3 (1963))
- NAGEL, PETER, 1971: 'Die Einwirkung des griechischen auf die Entstehung der koptischen Literatursprache' F. Altheim – R. Stiehl (eds.), *Christentum am Roten Meer*, vol.1 Berlin: De Gruyter, 327-355.
- NAGEL, PETER, 1998: "Ein koptisches Fragment aus Kyrill von Jerusalem (Cat. VI 22-24) über die Anfänge des Manichäismus (P. Heid. Inv. Kopt. 450)", *Études Coptes IV* (Cahiers de la bibliothèque copte 8), 40-52
- NESTLE, ERWIN – ALAND, KURT, 1993: *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27<sup>th</sup> revised edition, Stuttgart 1993 in: New Testament Transcripts: <http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de>
- ORÉAL, ELSA, 1999: "Contact Linguistique. Le cas du rapport entre le grec et le copte", *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature* 19, 289-306
- ORLANDI, TITO – QUECKE, HANS, 1974: *Papiri della università degli studio di Milano (P. Mil. Copti)*, Milano
- PORTER, STANLEY E., 1992: *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Sheffield: JSOT Press



- QUECKE, HANS, 1984: *Das Johannesevangelium saidisch. Text der Handschrift Ppalau Rib. Inv.Nr. 183 mit den Varianten der Handschriften 813 und 814 der Chester Beatty Library und der Handschrift 924569*, Roma-Barcelona
- RICHTER, TONIO SEBASTIAN, 2004: "Zur Sprache thebanischer Rechtsurkunden: auffällige Konstruktionen im Bereich der Zweiten Tempora" in: *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium* (Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies, Leiden, 27 August – 2 September 2000), *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 133
- RICHTER, TONIO SEBASTIAN, 2008: 'Coptic Letters', *AS/EA LXII/3*, 739-770.
- RICHTER, TONIO SEBASTIAN, 2009: 'Lexical Borrowing in Coptic. A Case Study in Loanword Typology', forthcoming in Haspelmath & Richter (eds.)
- SCHENKE, HANS-MARTIN (ed.), 1981: *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide)*, Texte und Untersuchungen 127, Berlin: Akademie Verlag
- SCHENKE, HANS-MARTIN (ed.), 2001: *Das Matthäus-Evangelium im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Schøyen)*, Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection II, Coptic Papyri I, Oslo: Hermes Publishing
- SHISHA-HALEVY, ARIEL, 1975: "Unpublished Shenoutiana in the British Library" *Enchoria* V, 53-108
- SHISHA-HALEVY, ARIEL, 1990: "The 'Tautological Infinitive' in Coptic: a Structural Examination" *Journal of Coptic Studies* 1, 99-127
- SHISHA-HALEVY, ARIEL, 1995: "Some Reflections on the Egyptian Conjunctive", *Divitiae Aegypti. Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause*, Wiesbaden, 300-314.
- STEINDORFF, GEORG, 1891: "Neue koptische Urkunden aus Theben", *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 29, 1.f. (cited from RICHTER, 2004)
- STERN, LUDWIG, 1880: *Koptische Grammatik*, Leipzig: T.O. Weigel

- THOMASON, SARAH G. – KAUFMAN, TERRENCE, 1988: *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, University of California Press
- THOMPSON, SIR HERBERT, 1924: *The Gospel of St. John According to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript*, London
- THOMPSON, SIR HERBERT, 1932: *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect*, Cambridge 1932
- VAN DER VLIET, JACQUES, 2003: *Catalogue of the Coptic Inscriptions in the Sudan National Museum at Khartoum*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 121
- VOLTEN, AKSEL, 1964: “The Late Egyptian Conjunctive” in: Rosén, H.B. (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H.J. Polotsky*, Jerusalem, 54-80.
- VÖÖBUS, ARTHUR, 1954: *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies*, Stockholm
- WALDSTEIN, MICHAEL – WISSE, FREDERIK, 1995: *The Apocryphon of John. Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV,1 with BG 8502,2* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 33) Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill
- WEIß, HANS-FRIEDRICH, 1966: “Zum Problem der griechischen Fremd- und Lehnwörter in den Sprachen des christlichen Orients“, *Helikon* 6, 139-209.
- WEIß, HANS-FRIEDRICH, 1969: “Ein Lexikon der griechischen Wörter im Koptischen” *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 96, 79-80.
- WINLOCK, HERBERT E. – CRUM, WALTER EWING, 1926: *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes, Part I*, New York
- YOUNG, DWIGHT W., 1993: *Coptic Manuscripts from the White Monastery: Works of Shenute*, Textband, (Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, XII. Folge), Wien